Reading Grade 4


1. Improvement Over Time

Have Texas' 4th graders improved in reading achievement?

Not yet. Between 1992 and 1998, there was no significant change in the percentage of public school 4th graders who met the Goals Panel's performance standard in reading.

The Goals Panel has set its performance standard at the two highest levels of achievement — Proficient or Advanced — on the National Assessment of Educational Progress, or NAEP.

Percentage of public school 4th graders at or above Proficient on the NAEP reading assessment



ns Interpret with caution. Change was not statistically significant. Reading performance will be tested again in 2002.

2. State Comparisons[†]

How did Texas compare with other states in 4th grade reading achievement in public schools in 1998?

2 states had significantly higher¹ percentages of students who were at or above Proficient on NAEP:

Connecticut 46% New Hampshire 38%

26 states had similar percentages of students who were at or above Proficient on NAEP:

Massachusetts, Montana	37%	Texas, Kentucky, Maryland, Missouri,	29 %
Maine, Minnesota	36%	New York, Washington,	
Iowa	35%	West Virginia	
Colorado, Kansas, Wisconsin	34%	Michigan, North Carolina, Oregon,	28%
Rhode Island	32%	Utah	
U.S.*	31%	Delaware, Tennessee	25%
Oklahoma, Virginia, Wyoming	30%	Alabama, Georgia	24%
Okianoma, virgima, vvyoming	30%	Alabama, Octorgia	24%


12 states had significantly lower¹ percentages of students who were at or above Proficient on NAEP:

Arkansas, Florida Arizona, New Mexico, South Carolina	23% 22%	Mississippi Hawaii	18% 17%
Nevada	21%	District of Columbia	10%
California	20%	Virgin Islands	8%
Louisiana	19%		

[†] The term "state" is used to refer to the 50 states, the District of Columbia, and the territories.

3. Subgroup Performance

What percentages of public school 4th graders in different subgroups in Texas were at or above Proficient on the 1998 NAEP reading assessment?



¹ Interpret differences between subgroups with caution. See pp. 2-3 and Appendix D.

¹ See explanation on pp. 2-3.

^{*} Figure shown for the U.S. includes both public and nonpublic school data.

²Characteristics of the sample do not permit a reliable estimate.

³ No data reported for 4th graders by parents' highest level of education in 1998.


1. Improvement Over Time

Have Texas' 8th graders improved in reading achievement?

In 1998, 28% of Texas' public school 8th graders met the Goals Panel's performance standard in reading. Improvement over time will be reported when reading is assessed again in 2002.

The Goals Panel has set its performance standard at the two highest levels of achievement — Proficient or Advanced — on the National Assessment of Educational Progress, or NAEP.

Percentage of public school 8th graders at or above Proficient on the NAEP reading assessment



Reading performance will be tested again in 2002.

2. State Comparisons⁺

How did Texas compare with other states in 8th grade reading achievement in public schools in 1998?

6 states had significantly higher percentages of students who were at or above Proficient on NAEP:

Connecticut, Maine	42%	Massachusetts	36%
Montana	38%	Kansas	35%
Minnesota	37%		

22 states had similar percentages of students who were at or above Proficient on NAEP:

New York	34%	Texas, Arizona	28%
U.S.,* Oregon, Virginia, Wisconsin	33%	West Virginia	27%
Washington	32%	Tennessee	26%
Maryland, North Carolina, Utah	31%	Delaware, Georgia	25%
Colorado, Rhode Island	30%	Nevada, New Mexico	24%
Kentucky, Missouri, Oklahoma,	29%	Florida ²	23%
Wyoming			


9 states had significantly lower¹ percentages of students who were at or above Proficient on NAEP:

Arkansas ² California. South Carolina	23%	Louisiana	18%
	22%	District of Columbia	12%
Alabama Hawaii, Mississippi	21%	Virgin Islands	10%

[†] The term "state" is used to refer to the 50 states, the District of Columbia, and the territories.

3. Subgroup Performance

What percentages of public school 8th graders in different subgroups in Texas were at or above Proficient on the 1998 NAEP reading assessment?



¹ Interpret differences between subgroups with caution. See pp. 2-3 and Appendix D.

¹ See explanation on pp. 2-3.

² State may appear to be out of place; however, statistically its placement is correct. See pp. 2-3.

^{*} Figure shown for the U.S. includes both public and nonpublic school data.

²Characteristics of the sample do not permit a reliable estimate.